UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,408	07/15/2005	Yasuaki Ito	10577.0004-00000	8596
	7590 05/13/201 ENDERSON, FARAB	EXAMINER		
LLP	ŕ	HOWARD, ZACHARY C		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/542,408	ITO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ZACHARY HOWARD	1646		

		ZACHARY HOWARD	1646						
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE	THE REPLY FILED 28 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
	 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is lat no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. 								
nave	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). In a second of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee are been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ander 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as								
set for may I	orth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing da	te of the final rejection, o	even if timely filed,					
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since					
3. 🛛	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered b	ecause					
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co								
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);							
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for					
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.						
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).							
4.	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
3. <u> </u>	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. 🛚	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of					
	Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,14 and 78-80</u> .								
4FFI	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: IDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.					
	UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	the data of NOT relations that a constitution in							
11. [The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowal	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:									
		/Pridget E Busser/							
		/Bridget E Bunner/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1647						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of fling a brief, will not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

In the proposed amendment to claim 1, the method would be amended to limit the cell-stimulating activity of step (ii) to one previously recited in dependent claim 14 (which would be canceled), with the exception of intracellular Ca2+ level increasing activity. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sidhu et al (2000) set forth previously at pg 8-12 of the 1/28/11 Office Action was based on a cell-stimulating activity that is an intracellular Ca2+ level increasing activity. Thus, the proposed amendment to claim 1 would require new search and consideration of the prior art to determine whether there is any prior art that anticipates or renders obvious the method of claim 1 as directed to a cell-stimulating activity that is one of those recited in the proposed amendments to claim 1 (intracellular cAMP production suppressing activity, MAP kinase phosphorylation or activation, ACTH secretion suppressing activity, glycerol production suppressing activity and lipolysis supressing activity).

In the proposed amendment to claim 3, the method would be amended to limit the fatty acid of step (i) to one that is labeled and selected from palmitoleic acid, linoleic acid, γ-linolenic acid, arachidonic acid, and docosahexaenoic acid. These limitations were not previously recited in the claims. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sidhu et al (2000) set forth previously at pg 8-12 of the 1/28/11 Office Action was based on a fatty acid that is dodecanoic acid. Thus, the proposed amendment to claim 1 would require new search and consideration of the prior art to determine whether there is any prior art that anticipates or renders obvious the method of claim 1 as directed to a fatty acid that is labeled and selected from palmitoleic acid, linoleic acid, γ-linolenic acid, arachidonic acid and docosahexanoic acid. It is noted that Sidhu et al teach that the response of STC-1 cells to fattay acids is mediated by a signal transduction pathway which is sensitive to fatty acids of chain lengths greater than 9 carbon atoms (pg 175), and each of the fatty acids recited in proposed claim 3 has a chain length greater than 9 carbon atoms.